

By George C. Wilson
Washington Post Staff Writer

A gold-lettered sign in the House Armed Services Committee hearing room symbolizes the congressional rebellion written into the \$58 billion defense appropriations bill President Johnson signed into law yesterday.

Rep. L. Mendel Rivers (D-S.C.) ordered the sign to be put up right in front of the witness table after he took over the committee chairmanship in 1965 from Rep. Carl Vinson (D-Ga.). The sign, quoting the Constitution, reads: "The Congress shall have power . . . to raise and support armies . . . provide and maintain a Navy . . . make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces."

It was in this spirit that the congressional military committees this year rebelled at approving another McNamara budget pretty much as is. The Congress, in the Fiscal 1967 Defense Department budget just passed, has made some basic military judgments of its own which conflict with those of Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara.

The area of disagreement is much larger than that in past years when the big issue was a single weapons system like the North American XB-70 bomber. This budget shows Congress reads the Soviet threat far differently than McNamara.

The primary example is the Nike X antiballistic missile system (ABM). The new military money bill contains \$167.9 million more than McNamara requested for Nike X. Of the increase, \$153.5 million is for buying the items needed to gear up for production of the system. The rest is to accelerate research.

In voting this extra money, Congress in effect came out for deployment of an antiballistic missile around the United States. The military committees reached this decision partly on the basis of secret testimony by intelligence officials that Russia seemed to be deploying an advanced ABM system around its cities as well as making progress on maneuverable warheads for ICBMs.

Technical arguments aside, deploying a Nike X system around the U.S. would set a faster pace in the arms race with Russia. This distresses such de-escalation advocates as Dr. Jerome B.

Wiesner, former science adviser to President Kennedy. But the majority of Congress now feels the U.S. cannot afford not to take out this ABM insurance.

McNamara's rising Vietnam war budget plus President Johnson's desire for an accommodation with Russia make it highly unlikely that the extra Nike X money will be spent. But this will not end the dispute. Congress will just push harder next year to get its way.

Another significant addition in the military budget is \$50 million for the Air Force manned orbiting laboratory (MOL). MOL is the program designed to put the military into manned space flight in a big way. Congress increased the budget for this flying laboratory from \$150 million to \$200 million at the very time support for the civilian space program is thinning out.

The congressional move toward reversing the emphasis on the civilian and military space roles recalls the old complaint of Chairman Richard B. Russell (D-Ga.) that the Air Force—not the National Aeronautics Space Administration—should have done the basic manned space flight research.

The difference of opinion between Congress and McNamara on strategic bombers accounted for another big addition to the budget—\$11.8 million to speed the development of a new U.S. bomber and \$55 million to keep the production line open on the Lockheed F-12 which would knock down any incoming Russian bombers.

Congress, in making these additions, showed it was not as willing as McNamara to rely so heavily on the present aged bomber fleet nor discount the Russian bomber threat. The advanced manned strategic aircraft, or AMSA, is the Air Force's new bomber concept. It has been kept in the early stages of development.

In its look at the Navy budget, Congress decided it was time to steam faster toward all-nuclear combat task forces. Chairman Rivers was the most outspoken in this re-

When the dust settled, Rivers had not won as much as he wanted. But Congress did revamp McNamara's plan by voting \$150.5 million for ships he did not want. Of that money, \$130.5 million would go for construction of a nuclear frigate carrying guided missiles and

\$20 million for the long-lead-time items for a second one. McNamara had requested about that much money instead for two conventionally powered destroyers. They were knocked out of his budget.

All told, McNamara's budget as finally passed by Congress was \$403 million above the requested total. But Congress did a major reshuffling under that ceiling. And it will fight the same battles again when the new money requests come in from the Defense Department in January.

Rep. F. Edward Hebert (D-La.), one of the congressional leaders of the McNamara rebellion, said of the 1966 tinkering with the defense budget: "It was an epochal year."

Congress Shows the In Writing Defense

10/16/66

Spirit of '66 Budget Bill